REMARKS

The office action of November 16, 2004 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1, and 3 through 21 remain in this case, claim 2 being cancelled by this response.

Claim 1 was amended to include allowable claim 2. Claim 5 was amended to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 3 was amended to change the claim dependency and claim 11 was amended to fix a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) for failing to include reference sign(s) mentioned in the description, specifically Zone 1, 2, and 3, (zones displayed as 12, 14, and 16). Zone 1, 2, and 3 have been added to Figures 1-4 and replacement drawings are filed with this response. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant believes that these amendments have fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, and the claims are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 9, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Groff et al. (USPN 5,906,485). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Applicant's claim 1 includes the step of "a) heating the belt with a belt warmer" and then "b) placing the parts on the belt" Groff et al. does teach or disclose the step of heating the belt with a belt warmer prior to placing the parts with the lubricant on the belt.

Therefore, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection of independent claim 1 as being anticipated by Groff et al. (USPN 5,906,485) is overcome. Dependent claims 9 and 10, being dependent upon and further limiting independent claim 1, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4 and 8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Such action has been taken for claim 2. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges Examiner's statement that claims 11-21 are allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:
Crump et al.

By:_____
Lynda Wood, Reg. No. 53,791
Agent for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: lwood@bpmlegal.com
Dated: February 9, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet(s) of drawings include changes as listed below. The attached replacement sheet(s) replace the original sheet(s).

The changes are as follows.

Zone 1, Zone 2, and Zone 3 have been added to Figures 1-4

Attachment: 4 Replacement Sheet(s)